

## Lecture 12: Pasch's Postulate

### 12.1 Pasch's Postulate

**Pasch's Theorem** Suppose  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  is a metric geometry which satisfies the plane separation axiom. If  $\ell$  is a line,  $\triangle ABC$  is a triangle,  $D \in \ell$ , and  $A - D - B$ , then either  $\ell \cap \overline{AC} \neq \emptyset$  or  $\ell \cap \overline{BC} \neq \emptyset$ .

In other words, in a metric geometry satisfying PSA, a line intersecting a triangle intersects at least two sides of the triangle.

**Proof** Suppose  $A - D - B$ ,  $D \in \ell \cap \triangle ABC$ , and  $\ell \cap \overline{AC} = \emptyset$ . First note that  $A \in \overline{AC}$ , so  $A \notin \ell$ . Thus  $\ell \neq \overleftrightarrow{AB}$ , and so  $B \notin \ell$ . Hence  $A$  and  $B$  are on opposite sides of  $\ell$ . Since  $A$  and  $C$  are on the same side of  $\ell$  (since  $\ell \cap \overline{AC} = \emptyset$ ), it follows that  $C$  and  $B$  are on opposite sides of  $\ell$ . Hence  $\overline{BC} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ .

**Definition** We say a metric geometry satisfies *Pasch's Postulate* (PP) if whenever  $\ell$  is a line,  $\triangle ABC$  is a triangle,  $D \in \ell$ , and  $A - D - B$ , then either  $\ell \cap \overline{AC} \neq \emptyset$  or  $\ell \cap \overline{BC} \neq \emptyset$ .

Note that the above theorem says that in a metric geometry, PSA implies PP.

**Theorem** Suppose  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  is a metric geometry satisfying Pasch's Postulate. If  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  are noncollinear points and  $\ell \cap \{A, B, C\} = \emptyset$ , then  $\ell$  cannot intersect all three sides of  $\triangle ABC$ .

**Proof** Suppose  $\{D\} = \ell \cap \overline{AB}$ ,  $\{E\} = \ell \cap \overline{AC}$ , and  $\{F\} = \ell \cap \overline{BC}$ . Suppose  $D - E - F$ . Now  $\overleftrightarrow{BD} = \overleftrightarrow{AB}$  and  $\overleftrightarrow{BF} = \overleftrightarrow{BC}$ , so  $B$ ,  $D$ , and  $F$  are not collinear. Now  $\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overleftrightarrow{DF} = \{E\}$ , so, by Pasch's Postulate, we must have either  $\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BD} \neq \emptyset$  or  $\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BF} \neq \emptyset$ . But

$$\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BD} \subset \overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overleftrightarrow{BD} = \{A\}$$

and  $A \notin \overline{BD}$  (since  $A - D - B$ ), so  $\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BD} = \emptyset$ . Also,

$$\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BF} \subset \overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overleftrightarrow{BF} = \{C\}$$

and  $C \notin \overline{BF}$  (since  $B - F - C$ ), so  $\overleftrightarrow{AC} \cap \overline{BF} = \emptyset$ . Hence our assumptions imply a contradiction of Pasch's Postulate.

**Theorem** A metric geometry  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  satisfying Pasch's Postulate also satisfies the plane separation axiom.

**Proof** Given a line  $\ell$ , let  $P$  be a point not on  $\ell$  and define

$$H_1 = \{Q : Q \in \mathcal{P}, Q = P \text{ or } \overline{PQ} \cap \ell = \emptyset\}$$

and

$$H_2 = \{Q : Q \in \mathcal{P}, Q \notin \ell, \overline{PQ} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Clearly,  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are disjoint and  $\mathcal{P} - \ell = H_1 \cup H_2$ .

We first show  $H_1$  is convex. Let  $R, S \in H_1$  and suppose  $R - T - S$ . If  $P, R$ , and  $S$  are collinear, then

$$\overline{RS} \subset \overline{PR} \cup \overline{PS} \subset H_1,$$

so  $T \in H_1$ . If  $P, R$ , and  $S$  are noncollinear, then  $\ell \cap \overline{PR} = \emptyset$  and  $\ell \cap \overline{PS} = \emptyset$ , with Pasch's Postulate applied to  $\triangle PRS$ , imply that  $\ell \cap \overline{RS} = \emptyset$ . But then  $\ell \cap \overline{PR} = \emptyset$  and  $\ell \cap \overline{RT} = \emptyset$ , with Pasch's Postulate applied to  $\triangle PRT$ , imply that  $\ell \cap \overline{PT} = \emptyset$ . Thus  $T \in H_1$ . Hence  $H_1$  is convex.

We next show that  $H_2$  is convex. Let  $R, S \in H_2$  and suppose  $R - T - S$ . If  $P, R$ , and  $S$  are collinear, then either

$$\overline{PR} \subset \overline{PT}$$

or

$$\overline{PS} \subset \overline{PT}.$$

Since both  $\overline{PR} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$  and  $\overline{PS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ , it follows that  $\overline{PT} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ , so, since  $T \notin \ell$ ,  $T \in H_2$ . If  $P, R$ , and  $S$  are noncollinear, first note that  $T \notin \ell$ , since that would imply that  $\ell$  intersects all three sides of  $\triangle PRS$ . Indeed, we must have  $\ell \cap \overline{RS} = \emptyset$ . In particular,  $\ell \cap \overline{RT} = \emptyset$ ; combined with  $\ell \cap \overline{PR} \neq \emptyset$  and Pasch's Postulate applied to  $\triangle PRT$ , this implies  $\ell \cap \overline{PT} \neq \emptyset$ . Thus  $T \in H_2$ . Hence  $H_2$  is convex.

Now suppose  $R \in H_1$  and  $S \in H_2$ . We need to show that  $\overline{RS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ . If  $R = P$ , then

$$\overline{RS} \cap \ell = \overline{PS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset,$$

and we are done. So assume  $R \neq P$ . If  $R, S$  and  $P$  are collinear, then either  $P - R - S$ ,  $R - P - S$ , or  $P - S - R$ . In the first case,  $\overline{PS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$  and  $\overline{PR} \cap \ell = \emptyset$  imply  $\overline{RS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ ; in the second case,  $\overline{PS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$  and  $\overline{PS} \subset \overline{RS}$  imply  $\overline{RS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ ; and the third case cannot occur because  $\overline{PS} \subset \overline{PR}$  would imply  $\overline{PR} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ . If  $R, S$ , and  $P$  are noncollinear, then  $\overline{PS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$  and  $\overline{PR} \cap \ell = \emptyset$  imply, with Pasch's Postulate applied to  $\triangle PRS$ , that  $\overline{RS} \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ .

## 12.2 Pasch geometries

**Definition** We call a metric geometry satisfying Pasch's Postulate (or, equivalently, satisfying the plane separation axiom) a *Pasch Geometry*.

**Example** The Euclidean Plane, the Poincaré Plane, and the Taxicab Plane are all Pasch Geometries.

**Example** Define a metric geometry  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  as follows: We let

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, x < 0 \text{ or } x \geq 1\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\ell \cap \mathcal{P} : \ell \in \mathcal{L}_E, \ell \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

To define  $d$ , we first define rulers. If  $\ell = L_a$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $a < 0$  or  $a \geq 1$ , define

$$f(x, y) = y$$

for all  $(x, y) \in \ell$ . If  $\ell = L_{m,b}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} x\sqrt{1+m^2}, & \text{if } x < 0, \\ (x-1)\sqrt{1+m^2}, & \text{if } x \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Given any two distinct points  $P$  and  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ , let  $f$  be the ruler as described above for  $\overleftrightarrow{PQ}$  and let

$$d(P, Q) = |f(P) - f(Q)|.$$

With these definitions,  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  is a metric geometry.

Now consider  $\triangle ABC$  where  $A = (-1, 0)$ ,  $B = (2, 0)$ , and  $C = (2, 3)$ . If  $\ell$  is the line with equation  $y = 1.5$  (that is,  $\ell = L_{0,1.5}$ ), then  $\ell \cap \overline{BC} = \{(2, 1.5)\}$ . However,  $\ell \cap \overline{AC} = \emptyset$  and  $\ell \cap \overline{AB} = \emptyset$ . Thus  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  is not a Pasch Geometry. We call  $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}, d\}$  the *Missing Strip Plane*.